

From: bear
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/25/02 9:02pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

It's no secret that Steve Case, Scott Mc Nealy and Larry Ellison are not friends of Microsoft. Competitors often disagree but usually settle their differences by letting the players, in this case the consumer to choose the winner.

What did Microsoft do wrong? Not charging individuals for Internet Explorer was brilliant. I was not hurt as a consumer it was free. As a result I recently downloaded the Netscape Browser for free. Would this be possible if Internet Explorer didn't exist? No matter how you look at it the consumer benefits. Yahoo adopted a similar business plan by giving consumers free access. As a user of all the listed products I think it's great.

In the end the DoJ will decide how big an impact on our economy this settlement will have. A speedy decision will help the economy by providing clarity by Quantifying risk. Investors in 401k, IRA's, mutual funds, state and federal pension plans, and individual investors nervously await the out come. Anything less will leave a cloud of uncertainty, which will keep MSFT and the rest of the market from focusing on their businesses. In this case all investors and the economy will be hurt.

I know the DoJ believes they are smarter and think I'm a simpleton. But my response is to protect my interests not that of MSFT. As a small business owner I believe in free market competition not protectionism. My view is Microsoft gave the end user the best deal. They gave us more for less with seem-less integration. Any claim to the effect things would be better if Microsoft innovation is impeded is pure speculation. How many innovations have competitors given to consumers at no charge? People and companies don't always make good on their claims and tend to exaggerate when "if and buts" are added in the mix.

Larry Oshita